ZHOU et al.
Serial No. 09/878,327
Response to Office Action dated April 21, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by OpenGroup (http://opengroup.org/security/sso). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants traverse this rejection.

Each of the independent claims 1, 7 and 13 calls for automatically generating mirror persons from an LDAP user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within a plurality of resources to identify the user across the resources. As described in connection with an illustrative, non-limiting example implementation in the subject patent application, multiple mirror persons may be generated, i.e., one for each resource. In this way, a user may, for example, use the same username and password to identify himself/herself across multiple resources. This reduces confusion among users resulting from multiple user names/passwords. In addition, the maintenance and updating of "persons" in the resources is eased.

OpenGroup discloses a single sign-on system that purports to address the "need to co-ordinate and where possible integrate user sign-on functions and user account management functions for the multitude of of different domains now found within an enterprise." OpenGroup, page 2 of 3. As further described:

> In the single sign-on approach the system is required to collect from the user, as part of the primary sign-on, all the identification information and user credential information necessary to support the authentication of the user to each of the secondary domains that the user may potentially require to interact with. The information supplied by the user is used by the Single Sign-On Service within the primary domain to support the authentication of the end user to each of the secondary domains with which the user actually requests to interact. OpenGroup, page 2 of 3 to page 3 of 3.

The Figure on page 2 of 3 suggests that the user signs on to the primary domain and can then access a secondary domain sign-on via primary domain shell. As discussed in the OpenGroup excerpt above, the information supplied by the user in signing on to the primary domain can be used by the sign-on service within the primary domain to support authentication of the user to the accessed secondary domain.

-6-

ZHOU et al.
Serial No. 09/878,327
Response to Office Action dated April 21, 2005

OpenGroup does not describe that mirror persons are used for this single sign-on capability and thus does not disclose or suggest generating mirror persons and maintaining these mirror persons within a plurality of resources to identify the user across the resources as claimed. As described in connection with an illustative example embodiment in the present application, the mirror persons are generated when an user account entry is created and thereafter maintained in the resources. If a user requests to access a resource, the mirror person within that resource will determine whether he or she has the right to access this resource and what level of the resource he or she can access. Paragraph [0024]. In contrast, OpenGroup describes that a sign-on service within the primary domain must be used to authenticate the user to the secondary domains (resources). There is no disclosure or suggestion of providing mirror persons within the secondary domains for identifying a user as claimed. Instead, in OpenGroup, authentication must be made with reference to a service within the primary domain.

For at least this reason, OpenGroup does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 10, 13 and 14.

Claims 5, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over OpenGroup in view of "what is well-known in the art." These claims depend respectively from claims 1, 7 and 13. While not acquiescing in the characterizations in the office action, OpenGroup would still be deficient with respect to these dependent claims even assuming (for the sake of argument only) that the allegations in the office action with respect to the features of claims 5, 11 and 15 were proper.

Claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over OpenGroup in view of Win et al. Here again, even assuming the database and Internet features of Win et al. were incorporated into OpenGroup, Win et al. is admittedly deficient with respect to the features of claims 1 and 7 from which claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 depend.

New claims 19-21 have been added. The subject matter of these claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter has been added. *See, e.g.,* paragraph [0024] and Figure 6. These claims are believed to be allowable because of their dependency from claims 1 and 7 and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

ZHOU et al.
Serial No. 09/878,327
Response to Office Action dated April 21, 2005

      The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

                                 Respectfully submitted,

                                 NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _Michael J. O'Shea_

                                   Michael J. Shea
                                   Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 8 -